

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawing includes a change to Figs. 11 and 12, which have been marked as being “Prior Art”. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figs. 11 and 12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Figs. 11 and 12 are objected to as being prior art but not being so labeled. The proposed drawing amendment has been submitted as requested by the Examiner.

The Examiner objected to the information disclosure statement filed on July 7, 2006, based on 1.98(a)(3), because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Applicant submitted English language abstracts of the cited foreign patent documents in the July 7 filing, which meets the requirements of section 1.98(a)(3). Therefore, the original IDS was in compliance. As a courtesy, Applicant is resubmitting a new IDS citing the two references. Applicant requests confirmation that the references have been considered.

New claims 3 and 4 have been added. Statutory support for the new claims can be found in paragraphs 0050 of the U.S. patent publication (No. 2008/0253724).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 recites “...optical fiber bundle reaches said emission window to be exposed”. Examiner is unclear as to what “exposed” refers to in this claim. The word “exposed” should be interpreted to modify the phrase “end section” of the unitized optical fiber bundle.

It appears to the Applicant that the Examiner is under the assumption that the window is a cover for the opening and protects the end of the unitized optical fiber bundle. There is, however,

no cover on the emission window, and as a result, the end section of the unitized optical fiber bundle is exposed at the emission window. Simply stated, the emission window is the opening. Figures 1 and 2 show that an exposed section 15 of the fiber bundle is exposed at the emission window 7. See paragraph 0052 of the U.S. patent publication. As support for this, in Fig. 4 of the publication, it is illustrated that the fiber bundle is pulled through the emission window. This would not be possible if there were covers on the emission windows. Further, in Fig. 2 of the publication, it is illustrated that the unitized optical fiber bundle abuts the surface of the opening/emission window. Again this would not be possible if there were covers on the emission windows.

In Claim 2, the Examiner also expresses confusion on the recitation "...exposed surface of said unitized optical fiber bundle in said emission window is on the same level with a surrounding surface of said housing." Examiner is unclear as how this is achieved. The Examiner is correct in determining that the exterior surface of the emission window is on the same level with the surrounding surface of the housing. As stated above, it appears the Examiner assumes the window is a cover on the opening. However, as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2, the window is the opening and a cover for the opening is not required. Thus, the end section of the unitized optical fiber bundle is on the same level with the surrounding housing surface.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kinoshita (U.S. Patent No. 3,818,902). Applicant respectfully asserts that Kinoshita fails to disclose every element of claim 1. Applicant claims that the end section of the unitized optical fiber bundle reaches said emission window to be exposed. Conversely, the optical fibers in Kinoshita are covered by the illumination window. See Fig. 2, element 6 of Kinoshita. Accordingly, the end section of the optical fibers in Kinoshita is not exposed as defined the claim. Because Kinoshita

does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 1, Kinoshita fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. OHNO-40912.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 3, 2008